

THE STANLEY DEPTH OF SOME POWER SETS OF MULTISSETS

Yinghui Wang

*Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
yinghui@mit.edu*

Abstract

In this paper, we study the Stanley depth for the partially ordered set (poset) of nonempty submultisets of a multiset. We find the Stanley depth explicitly for any multiset with at most five distinct elements and provide an upper bound for the general case. On the other hand, the elements of a product of chains corresponds to the submultisets of a multiset. We prove that the Stanley depth of the product of chains $\mathbf{n}^k \setminus \mathbf{0}$ is $(n-1)\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$. At the end, we show that the Stanley depth for any case of a multiset with n distinct elements can be determined if we know all interval partitions of the poset of nonempty subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [1], R. P. Stanley defined what is now called the Stanley depth of a $\mathbb{Z}^n$ -graded module over a commutative ring. He conjectured that the Stanley depth was always at least the depth of the module. The notion of Stanley depth can be carried over to partially ordered sets (posets). In [2], Biro, Howard, Keller, Trotter and Young proved that the Stanley depth of the poset of nonempty subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ordered by inclusion is $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. In this paper, we will study the Stanley depth of the poset of nonempty submultisets of a multiset ordered by inclusion, and find the Stanley depth for some types of multisets.

This paper begins with the definition of the Stanley depth of partitions and posets in Section 2. Section 3 proves that one of the interval partitions with the maximal Stanley depth has a special form and provides an upper bound for the Stanley depth for a general multiset. Section 4 shows that the Stanley depth of the product of chains $\mathbf{n}^k \setminus \mathbf{0}$ is $(n-1)\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$. Section 5 determines the Stanley depth for the cases $k = 1$, $k = 2$, and $k = 3$, Section 6 the case of $k = 4$, and finally, Section 7 the case of $k = 5$.

2. DEFINITIONS AND NOTATIONS

For a given multiset S , let $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denote the poset of all submultisets of S ordered by inclusion. Define the *depth* of an element $X \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, denoted $\text{depth } X$, as the maximal length of a chain $X = X_0 > X_1 > X_2 > \cdots > X_n$ in $\mathcal{B}(S)$. For any two sets $X \leq Y$ in $\mathcal{B}(S)$, define $[X, Y] = \{Z : X \subseteq Z \subseteq Y\}$. $[X, Y]$ is called an *interval* in $\mathcal{B}(S)$. Note that intervals are always nonempty.

An *interval partition* of the poset $[S]$ is a partition of $[S]$ into nonempty pairwise disjoint intervals. Let P be an interval partition of the poset $[S] = \mathcal{B}(S) \setminus \emptyset$. Define the *Stanley depth* of P to be

$$\text{sdepth } P := \min_{[X, Y] \in P} \text{depth } Y,$$

and the Stanley depth of $[S]$ to be

$$\text{sdepth } [S] := \max_P \text{sdepth } P,$$

where the maximum is taken over all interval partitions P of $[S]$.

For a given multiset $S = \{1, 1, \dots, 1, 2, 2, \dots, 2, \dots, k, k, \dots, k\}$, where there are n_i i 's, $n_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, let L_S be a product of chains $(\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathbf{1}) \times (\mathbf{n}_2 + \mathbf{1}) \times \cdots \times (\mathbf{n}_k + \mathbf{1})$, where $\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{1}$ denotes the $(n+1)$ -element chain $0 < 1 < \cdots < n$. The element $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ of L_S corresponds to the submultiset x of S which consists of x_i i 's. Denote $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$ by $\mathbf{0}$, and $L_S \setminus \mathbf{0} = [S]$ by $[n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k]$.

3. THE GENERAL CASE

In this section, we will show that there exists a partition with the maximal Stanley depth such that each interval of this partition has a special form. We will also give an upper bound for the Stanley depth for a general multiset.

An interval partition P of $[S]$ is called *best* if $\text{sdepth } P = \text{sdepth } [S]$. If P and Q are two interval partitions of $[S]$ with $\text{sdepth } P > \text{sdepth } Q$, we say P is *better* than Q .

Let $U_k = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. For any $u \in L_{U_k}$, define $s(u) = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$, where

$$v_i = \begin{cases} 0, & u_i = 0, \\ n_i, & u_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

An interval partition P of $[S]$ is called *good* if each interval in P has the form $[s(x), s(y)]$, where $x, y \in L_{U_k}$.

Proposition 3.1. *There exists a best interval partition P of $[S]$ such that P is good.*

Proof. For any submultiset T of S and interval partition P of $[S]$, let the induced partition of P in T be $P_T = \{I \cap T : I \in P\}$, where $I \cap T$ is the induced interval of I in T . It is easy to verify that P_{U_k} is an interval partition of $[U_k]$.

Consider the top elements of intervals in P_{U_k} . For any interval $I = [x, y] \in P_{U_k}$, I must be the intersection of $[U_k]$ and an interval $J = [x', y'] \in P$. For any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, since $I \subseteq J$, $y \leq y'$ and thus $y_i \leq y'_i$. If $y'_i > 0$, then $y_i = 1$ and $y'_i \leq n_i$; if $y'_i = 0$, then $y_i = 0$. Note that the depth of submultiset $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ is $\sum_{i=1}^k x_i$, thus

$$\text{sdepth } P \leq \text{depth } y' = \sum_{i=1}^k y'_i \leq \sum_{y_i=1} n_i = \text{depth } s(y).$$

Let d be the Stanley depth of $[S]$. If P is a best partition of $[S]$, then $\text{sdepth } P = d$. Therefore,

$$d = \text{sdepth } P \leq \min_{[x,y] \in P_{U_k}} \text{depth } s(y),$$

where the minimum is taken over all intervals in P_{U_k} .

Let $Q = P_{U_k}$ and $R = \{[s(x), s(y)] : [x, y] \in Q\}$, then R is an interval partition of $[S]$ and $\text{sdepth } R = \min_{[x,y] \in Q} \text{depth } s(y) \geq d$, where the minimum is taken over all intervals in Q . On the other hand, since $\text{sdepth } R \leq d$, $\text{sdepth } R = d$. Therefore R is a best partition. Note that R is also a good partition, so we are done. $\square$

By Proposition 3.1, to determine $\text{sdepth } [S]$, it suffices to find a partition with the greatest sdepth among all good partitions. We assume that all of the partitions that we study in the rest of this paper are good, and, without loss of generalization, $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_k$.

For convenience, we write an interval of a good partition by the top and bottom elements of its induced interval in U_k . For example, $[(n_1, 0, 0, 0, n_5), (n_1, n_2, 0, 0, n_5)]$ is written as $[10001, 11001]$. We also denote $\sum_{i \in I} n_i$ by $\langle I \rangle$. For example, $\langle 12 \rangle = n_1 + n_2$.

Since each of the k elements $(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, (0, 0, \dots, 0, 1)$ is no greater than any other element of $[S]$, they must be the bottom elements of k intervals. Let the k intervals be $I(i)$, and $a(i)$ the top element of $I(i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. We will study the $a(i)$'s to find the Stanley depth and need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *For any i, j with $i \neq j$, if $a(i)_j > 0$, then $a(j)_i = 0$.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Assume that there exist i and j such that $a(i)_j, a(j)_i > 0$. Consider the element x with $x_i = x_j = 1$ and $x_k = 0$ for any k other than i, j . x is included in $I(i)$ and $I(j)$. However,

since P is a partition, $I(i) \cap I(j) = \emptyset$. This leads to a contradiction, so we are done. $\square$

By Lemma 3.2, we can find an upper bound for the Stanley depth of $[S]$, as shown in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *The Stanley depth of $[n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k]$ with $1 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_k$ and $k \geq 2$ is at most $\max\{\langle 12 \cdots (k-1) \rangle, \langle k \rangle\}$.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction. If there exists a partition P such that $\text{sdepth } P > \max\{\langle 12 \cdots (k-1) \rangle, \langle k \rangle\}$, then $\text{depth } a(i) > \langle k \rangle, \langle 12 \cdots (k-1) \rangle$, thus $a(i)_k$ must be positive, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(k)_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$. Therefore, $\text{depth } a(k) \leq \langle k \rangle$. This leads to a contradiction, so we are done. $\square$

4. CASE OF $\mathbf{n}^k$

In this section, we will determine the Stanley depth for $\mathbf{n}^k \setminus \mathbf{0}$, $n \geq 2$, namely the case of $n_i = n-1$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. The case of $n = 2$ was solved in [2], as stated the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *The Stanley depth of $[U_k]$ is $\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$. Note that $\mathbf{2}^k \setminus \mathbf{0}$ is isomorphic to $[U_k]$, thus $\text{sdepth } \mathbf{2}^k \setminus \mathbf{0} = \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$.*

For $n > 2$, by Proposition 3.1, there exists a best partition P of $[S]$ such that it is also good. Thus,

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{sdepth } P &= \min_{[x,y] \in P} \text{depth } y = \min_{[x',y'] \in P_{U_k}} \text{depth } y \\ &= \min_{[x',y'] \in P_{U_k}} \text{depth } s(y'), \end{aligned}$$

where $[x', y']$ is the induced interval of $[x, y]$ in P_{U_k} .

Note that for any $u \in U_k$, $s(u) = (n-1) \cdot u$, thus

$$(4.2) \quad \text{depth } s(u) = \sum_{i=1}^k s(u)_i = (n-1) \sum_{i=1}^k u_i = (n-1) \text{depth } u.$$

By (4.1) and (4.2), we get

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{sdepth } P &= \min_{[x',y'] \in P_{U_k}} (n-1) \text{depth } y' = (n-1) \min_{[x',y'] \in P_{U_k}} \text{depth } y' \\ &= (n-1) \text{sdepth } P_{U_k}. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 4.1, $\text{sdepth } P_{U_k} \leq \text{sdepth } U_k = \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$, therefore

$$\text{sdepth } P \leq (n-1) \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil.$$

On the other hand, $(n-1)\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$ can be achieved. Let Q be a best partition of U_k and $P = \cup_{[x,y] \in Q} [s(x), s(y)]$, then $P_{U_k} = Q$. By (4.3),

$$\text{sdepth } P = (n-1)\text{sdepth } Q = (n-1)\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil.$$

Hence, we have proved:

Theorem 4.2. $\text{sdepth } \mathbf{n}^k \setminus \mathbf{0} = (n-1)\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$.

5. CASE OF $k = 1$, $k = 2$, AND $k = 3$

5.1. $k = 1$.

The case of $k = 1$ is trivial. Since 1 is less than any element of L , for any interval partition P of $[S]$, 1 must be the bottom element of an interval of P . Therefore, the Stanley depth of $[n_1]$ is n_1 .

5.2. $k = 2$.

By Proposition 3.3, the Stanley depth of $[S]$ is at most n_2 . On the other hand, the partition $[10, 11] \cup [01]$ has sdepth n_2 . Therefore, the Stanley depth of $[n_1, n_2]$ is n_2 .

5.3. $k = 3$.

By Proposition 3.3, the Stanley depth is at most $\max\{\langle 3 \rangle, \langle 12 \rangle\}$. On the other hand, the following two examples show that $\max\{\langle 3 \rangle, \langle 12 \rangle\}$ can be achieved. Therefore, the Stanley depth of $[n_1, n_2, n_3]$ is $\max\{\langle 3 \rangle, \langle 12 \rangle\}$.

Example 5.1. *Stanley depth* = $\langle 3 \rangle$:

$$[110, 111], [100, 101], [010, 011], [001].$$

Example 5.2. *Stanley depth* = $\langle 12 \rangle$:

$$[100, 110], [001, 101], [010, 011], [111].$$

6. CASE OF $k = 4$

Theorem 6.1. *The Stanley depth of $[n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4]$ is*

$$\max\{\langle 4 \rangle, \min\{\langle 24 \rangle, \langle 123 \rangle\}\}.$$

Proof. Denote the value of above formula by d_4 . The following examples show that d_4 can be achieved.

Example 6.2. *Stanley depth* = $\langle 4 \rangle$:

$$[1100, 1111], [1000, 1011], [0100, 0111], [0010, 0011], [0001].$$

Example 6.3. *Stanley depth* = $\min\{\langle 24 \rangle, \langle 123 \rangle\}$:

$[1000, 1011], [0100, 1110], [0010, 0011], [0001, 0101], [1101, 1111], [0111]$.

We will prove by contradiction that the sdepth of any interval partition of $[S]$ is no greater than d_4 . Assume that P is an interval partition of S such that $\text{sdepth } P > d_4$. There are two possibilities for $\min\{\langle 24 \rangle, \langle 123 \rangle\}$, $\langle 24 \rangle$ and $\langle 123 \rangle$.

Case 6.1. $\min\{\langle 24 \rangle, \langle 123 \rangle\} = \langle 24 \rangle$.

Since $\langle 24 \rangle \geq \langle 4 \rangle$, $d_4 = \max\{\langle 4 \rangle, \langle 24 \rangle\} = \langle 24 \rangle$. Hence, $\text{depth } a(i) \geq \text{sdepth } P > \langle 24 \rangle$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Consider $a(4)_3$.

(i) If $a(4)_3 = 0$, then $a(4)_1, a(4)_2 > 0$ because $\text{depth } a(4) > \langle 24 \rangle$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(1)_4 = a(2)_4 = 0$. Since $\text{depth } a(1) > \langle 24 \rangle \geq \langle 13 \rangle$, $a(1)_2, a(1)_3 > 0$. Thus, $a(3)_1 = a(2)_1 = 0$. Therefore, $\text{depth } a(2) \leq \langle 23 \rangle \leq \langle 24 \rangle$, contradiction!

(ii) If $a(4)_3 > 0$, then by Lemma 3.2, $a(3)_4 = 0$. Since $\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 24 \rangle \geq \langle 23 \rangle \geq \langle 13 \rangle$, $a(3)_1, a(3)_2 > 0$. Thus, $a(1)_3 = a(2)_3 = 0$. Since $\text{depth } a(2) > \langle 24 \rangle$, $a(2)_1 > 0$. Thus $a(1)_2 = 0$. Therefore, $\text{depth } a(1) \leq \langle 14 \rangle \leq \langle 24 \rangle$, contradiction!

Case 6.2. $\min\{\langle 24 \rangle, \langle 123 \rangle\} = \langle 123 \rangle$.

$d_4 = \max\{\langle 4 \rangle, \langle 123 \rangle\}$. We have proved in Proposition 3.3 that the sdepth of any partition is no greater than d_3 , so we are done. $\square$

7. CASE OF $k = 5$

Theorem 7.1. *The Stanley depth of $[n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5]$ is*

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{\langle 5 \rangle, \min\{\langle 35 \rangle, \langle 1234 \rangle\}, \min\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 234 \rangle, \langle 135 \rangle\}, \\ & \min\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 1234 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle\}, \min\{\langle 125 \rangle, \langle 134 \rangle\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Denote the value of above formula by d_5 . The following examples show that d_5 can be achieved.

Example 7.2. *Stanley depth* = $\langle 5 \rangle$:

$[11000, 11111], [10000, 10111], [01000, 01111], [00100, 00111],$
 $[00001, 00011], [00010]$.

Example 7.3. *Stanley depth* = $\min\{\langle 35 \rangle, \langle 1234 \rangle\} \equiv m_1$:

[10000, 10101], [01000, 01101], [00100, 00101], [00010, 11110]
 [00001, 00011], [01011, 01111], [10011, 10111], [11000, 11101],
 [11111], [11011], [00111].

Example 7.4. *Stanley depth* = $\min\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 234 \rangle, \langle 135 \rangle\} \equiv m_2$:

[00001, 00011], [00010, 01110], [00100, 10101], [01000, 01101],
 [10000, 10011], [00111, 01111], [10110, 10111], [11000, 11111],
 [01011].

Example 7.5. *Stanley depth* = $\min\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 1234 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle\} \equiv m_3$:

[00001, 00011], [00010, 11110], [00100, 10101], [01000, 01101],
 [10000, 11001], [10011, 10111], [01110, 01111], [11100, 11101],
 [11011, 11111], [00111].

Example 7.6. *Stanley depth* = $\min\{\langle 125 \rangle, \langle 134 \rangle\} \equiv m_4$:

[10000, 11001], [01000, 01110], [00100, 10101], [00010, 10110],
 [00001, 01011], [10011, 11011], [01101, 01111], [11010, 11110],
 [00111, 10111], [11100, 11101], [11111].

We will prove by contradiction that the sdepth of any interval partition of $[S]$ is no greater than d_5 . Assume that P is an interval partition of S such that $\text{sdepth } P > d_5$. There are two possibilities for m_1 , $\langle 1234 \rangle$ and $\langle 35 \rangle$.

Case 7.1. $m_1 = \langle 1234 \rangle$.

Since

$$(7.1) \quad \langle 1234 \rangle \geq \langle 234 \rangle \geq \min\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 234 \rangle, \langle 135 \rangle\} = m_2,$$

$$(7.2) \quad \langle 1234 \rangle \geq \min\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 1234 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle\} = m_3,$$

and

$$(7.3) \quad \langle 1234 \rangle \geq \langle 134 \rangle \geq \min\{\langle 125 \rangle, \langle 134 \rangle\} = m_4,$$

we have

$$d_5 = \max\{\langle 1234 \rangle, \langle 5 \rangle\}.$$

Thus we are done by Proposition 3.3.

Case 7.2. $m_1 = \langle 35 \rangle$.

There are three possibilities for m_2 , $\langle 234 \rangle$, $\langle 45 \rangle$ and $\langle 135 \rangle$.

Subcase 7.2.1. $m_2 = \langle 234 \rangle$.

m_3 can be $\langle 1234 \rangle$, $\langle 45 \rangle$ or $\langle 125 \rangle$.

Subcase 7.2.1.1. $m_3 = \langle 1234 \rangle$.

By (7.1)-(7.3), $d_5 = \max\{\langle 1234 \rangle, \langle 5 \rangle\}$. Thus we are done by Proposition 3.3.

Subcase 7.2.1.2. $m_3 = \langle 45 \rangle$.

Since

$$(7.4) \quad \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle = m_1 \geq \langle 5 \rangle,$$

and

$$(7.5) \quad \langle 234 \rangle \geq \langle 134 \rangle \geq \min\{\langle 125 \rangle, \langle 134 \rangle\} = m_4,$$

we get

$$d_5 = \max\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 234 \rangle\}.$$

Hence, $\text{depth } a(i) \geq \text{sdepth } P > \langle 45 \rangle, \langle 234 \rangle$. Let us consider the $a(i)_5$'s.

If there exist $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that $a(j)_5 = 0$, then $a(j)_i > 0$ for any $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, because $\text{depth } a(j) > \langle 234 \rangle$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(i)_j = 0$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \setminus \{j\}$. Thus $a(i)_5 > 0$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \setminus \{j\}$. (Otherwise, if $a(i)_5 = 0 = a(i)_j$, then $\text{depth } a(i) \leq \langle 1234 \rangle - a(i)_j \leq \langle 234 \rangle$.) Therefore, $\text{depth } a(5) \leq a(5)_j + a(5)_5 \leq \langle 45 \rangle$, contradiction!

Hence $a(j)_5 > 0$ for any $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(5)_j = 0$. Therefore $\text{depth } a(5) \leq a(5)_5 \leq \langle 45 \rangle$. which also results in a contradiction.

Subcase 7.2.1.3. $m_3 = \langle 125 \rangle$.

By (7.4) and (7.5), we get

$$d_5 = \max\{\langle 35 \rangle, \langle 234 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle\}.$$

Hence, for any i , $\text{depth } a(i) \geq \text{sdepth } P > \langle 35 \rangle, \langle 234 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle$.

By the same analysis as in Subcase 6.2.1.2, we can prove that $a(j)_5 > 0$ for any $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.2, $a(5)_j = 0$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since $\text{depth } a(i) > \langle 35 \rangle > \langle 5 \rangle$, $a(5)_4 > 0$. Thus, $a(4)_5 = 0$ by Lemma 3.2. Using the analysis in Subcase 6.2.1.2 again, we get $a(4)_i > 0$ and $a(i)_4 = 0$ for any $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since $\text{depth } a(i) > \langle 125 \rangle$, $a(1)_3, a(2)_3 > 0$. Thus, by Lemma 3.2, $a(3)_1 = a(3)_2 = 0$. Therefore, $\text{depth } a(3) \leq \langle 35 \rangle$, contradiction!

Subcase 7.2.2. $m_2 = \langle 45 \rangle$.

m_4 can be $\langle 125 \rangle$ or $\langle 134 \rangle$.

Subcase 7.2.2.1. $m_4 = \langle 125 \rangle$.

By (7.4),

$$d_5 = \max\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle\}.$$

Hence, for any i , $\text{depth } a(i) \geq \text{sdepth } P > \langle 45 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle$. Since $\text{depth } a(4) > \langle 125 \rangle \geq \langle 124 \rangle$, $a(4)_3 + a(4)_5 > 0$. Therefore, at least one of $a(4)_3$ and $a(4)_5$ is positive.

(i) $a(4)_5 > 0$.

By Lemma 3.2, $a(5)_4 = 0$.

$$(7.6) \quad \text{depth } a(5) > \langle 125 \rangle \Rightarrow a(5)_3 > 0 \Rightarrow a(3)_5 = 0.$$

$$(7.7) \quad \text{depth } a(3) > \langle 125 \rangle \geq \langle 123 \rangle \Rightarrow a(3)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_3 = 0.$$

Since $\text{depth } a(5) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle$ and $a(5)_4 = 0$, $a(5)_1 + a(5)_2 > 0$. Thus, at least one of $a(5)_1$ and $a(5)_2$ is positive.

If $a(5)_1 > 0$, then, by Lemma 3.2, $a(1)_5 = 0$.

$$(7.8) \quad \text{depth } a(1) > \langle 125 \rangle \geq \langle 123 \rangle \Rightarrow a(1)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_1 = 0.$$

$$(7.9) \quad \text{depth } a(4) > \langle 45 \rangle, (7.16), (7.7) \Rightarrow a(4)_2 > 0 \Rightarrow a(2)_4 = 0.$$

$$(7.10) \quad \text{depth } a(4) > \langle 123 \rangle, (7.9) \Rightarrow a(2)_3 > 0 \Rightarrow a(3)_2 = 0.$$

$$\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 34 \rangle, (7.10), (7.6) \Rightarrow a(3)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_3 = 0.$$

Thus, $\text{depth } a(1) \leq \langle 124 \rangle \leq \langle 125 \rangle$. Contradiction!

Hence $a(5)_1 = 0 < a(5)_2$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(2)_5 = 0$.

$$(7.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{depth } a(2) > \langle 125 \rangle \geq \langle 124 \rangle \Rightarrow a(2)_3, a(2)_4 > 0 \\ &\Rightarrow a(3)_2 = a(4)_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.12) \quad \text{depth } a(3) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 34 \rangle, (7.11) \Rightarrow a(3)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_3 = 0.$$

$$(7.13) \quad \text{depth } a(4) > \langle 45 \rangle, (7.7), (7.11) \Rightarrow a(4)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_4 = 0.$$

By (7.12) and (7.13), $\text{depth } a(1) \leq \langle 125 \rangle$, contradiction!

(ii) $a(4)_3 > 0 = a(4)_5$.

By Lemma 3.2, $a(3)_4 = 0$.

$$(7.14) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 125 \rangle \geq \langle 123 \rangle, a(3)_4 = 0 \Rightarrow a(3)_5 > 0 \\ &\Rightarrow a(5)_3 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.15) \quad \text{depth } a(5) > \langle 125 \rangle, (7.14) \Rightarrow a(5)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_5 = 0.$$

Since $\text{depth } a(5) > \langle 45 \rangle$ and $a(5)_3 = 0$ ((7.14)), $a(5)_1 + a(5)_2 > 0$. Thus, at least one of $a(5)_1$ and $a(5)_2$ is positive.

If $a(5)_1 > 0$, then $a(1)_5 = 0$ by Lemma 3.2.

$$(7.16) \quad \text{depth } a(1) > \langle 125 \rangle \geq \langle 123 \rangle \Rightarrow a(1)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_1 = 0.$$

$$(7.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(4) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 34 \rangle, a(4)_1 = a(4)_5 = 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_2 > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(2)_4 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.18) \quad \text{depth } a(2) > \langle 125 \rangle, (7.17) \Rightarrow a(2)_3 > 0 \Rightarrow a(3)_2 = 0.$$

$\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle, a(3)_4 = 0, (7.18) \Rightarrow a(3)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_3 = 0$.
By $a(1)_3 = a(1)_5 = 0$, $\text{depth } a(1) \leq \langle 124 \rangle \leq \langle 125 \rangle$, contradiction!

Hence $a(5)_1 = 0 < a(5)_2$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(2)_5 = 0$.

$$(7.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(2) > \langle 125 \rangle \geq \langle 124 \rangle \Rightarrow a(2)_3, a(2)_4 > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(3)_2 = a(4)_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle, a(3)_4 = 0, (7.19) \Rightarrow a(3)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_3 = 0$.

$\text{depth } a(4) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 34 \rangle, (7.15), (7.19) \Rightarrow a(4)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_4 = 0$.

By $a(1)_3 = a(1)_4 = 0$, $\text{depth } a(1) \leq \langle 125 \rangle$, contradiction!

Subcase 7.2.2.2. $m_4 = \langle 134 \rangle$.

By (7.4),

$$d_5 = \max\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 134 \rangle\}.$$

Hence, for any i , $\text{depth } a(i) \geq \text{sdepth } P > \langle 45 \rangle, \langle 134 \rangle$. Since $\text{depth } a(4) > \langle 134 \rangle \geq \langle 124 \rangle$, $a(4)_3 + a(4)_5 > 0$. Thus, at least one of $a(4)_3$ and $a(4)_5$ is positive.

(i) $a(4)_5 > 0$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(5)_4 = 0$. Since $\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 134 \rangle \geq \langle 123 \rangle$, $a(3)_4 + a(3)_5 > 0$. Thus, at least one of $a(3)_4$ and $a(3)_5$ is positive.

If $a(3)_5 > 0$, then $a(5)_3 = 0$ by Lemma 3.2.

$$(7.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(5) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 25 \rangle, a(5)_3 = a(5)_4 = 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(5)_1, a(5)_2 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_5 = a(2)_5 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(1) > \langle 134 \rangle, (7.20) \Rightarrow a(1)_i > 0, i = 1, 2, 3 \\ & \Rightarrow a(i)_1 = 0, i = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(2) > \langle 134 \rangle, (7.20), (7.21) \\ & \Rightarrow a(2)_3, a(2)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(3)_2 = a(4)_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle, (7.21), (7.22) \Rightarrow a(3)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_3$.

By $a(4)_1 = a(4)_2 = a(4)_3 = 0$, $\text{depth } a(4) \leq \langle 45 \rangle$, contradiction!

Hence $a(3)_5 = 0 < a(3)_4$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(4)_3 = 0$.

$$(7.23) \quad \text{depth } a(3) > \langle 134 \rangle, a(3)_5 = 0 \Rightarrow a(3)_2 > 0 \Rightarrow a(2)_3 = 0.$$

$$(7.24) \quad \text{depth } a(2) > \langle 134 \rangle \geq \langle 124 \rangle, (7.23) \Rightarrow a(2)_5 > 0 \Rightarrow a(5)_2 = 0.$$

$$(7.25) \quad \text{depth } a(5) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle, (7.24) \Rightarrow a(5)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_5 = 0.$$

$$(7.26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(1) > \langle 134 \rangle, (7.29) \Rightarrow a(1)_i > 0, i = 2, 3, 4 \\ & \Rightarrow a(i)_1 = 0, i = 2, 3, 4. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{depth } a(2) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 25 \rangle, (7.23), (7.26) \Rightarrow a(2)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_2 = 0.$$

By $a(4)_1 = a(4)_2 = a(4)_3 = 0$, $\text{depth } a(4) \leq \langle 45 \rangle$, contradiction!

(ii) $a(4)_5 = 0 < a(4)_3$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(3)_4 = 0$.

$$(7.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(4) > \langle 134 \rangle, a(4)_5 = 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_2, a(4)_3 > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(2)_4 = 0 = a(3)_4. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.28) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(2), \text{depth } a(3) > \langle 134 \rangle \geq \langle 123 \rangle, (7.27) \\ & \Rightarrow a(2)_5, a(3)_5 > 0 \Rightarrow a(5)_2 = a(5)_3 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.29) \quad \text{depth } a(5) > \langle 45 \rangle, (7.28) \Rightarrow a(5)_1 > 0 \Rightarrow a(1)_5 = 0.$$

Note that (7.26) still holds for this case.

$$\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 45 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle, (7.27), (7.26) \Rightarrow a(3)_2 > 0 \Rightarrow a(2)_3 = 0.$$

By $a(2)_1 = a(2)_3 = a(2)_4 = 0$ ((7.27)), $\text{depth } a(2) \leq \langle 25 \rangle \geq \langle 45 \rangle$, contradiction!

Subcase 7.2.3. $m_2 = \langle 135 \rangle$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 35 \rangle \geq \min\{\langle 35 \rangle, \langle 1234 \rangle\} = m_1, \\ & \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 125 \rangle \geq \min\{\langle 45 \rangle, \langle 125 \rangle, \langle 1234 \rangle\} = m_3 \geq \langle 5 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 125 \rangle \geq \min\{\langle 125 \rangle, \langle 134 \rangle\} = m_4,$$

we have

$$d_5 = \langle 135 \rangle.$$

Hence, for any i , $\text{depth } a(i) \geq \text{sdepth } P > \langle 135 \rangle$. Since $\text{depth } a(3) > \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 123 \rangle$, at least one of $a(3)_4$ and $a(3)_5$ is positive.

(i) $a(3)_5 > 0$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(5)_3 = 0$.

If $a(3)_4 > 0$, then $a(4)_3 = 0$.

$$(7.30) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(4) > \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 124 \rangle, a(4)_3 = 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_5 > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(5)_4 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\text{depth } a(5) \leq \langle 125 \rangle \leq \langle 135 \rangle$, contradiction! Hence $a(3)_4 = 0$.

$$(7.31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(2) > \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 124 \rangle \Rightarrow a(2)_4, a(2)_5 > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(4)_2 = a(5)_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{depth } a(5) > \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 15 \rangle, (7.33) \Rightarrow a(5)_4 > 0 \Rightarrow a(4)_5 = 0.$$

By $a(4)_2 = a(4)_5 = 0$, $\text{depth } a(4) \leq \langle 134 \rangle \leq \langle 135 \rangle$, contradiction!

(ii) $a(3)_5 = 0 < a(3)_4$. By Lemma 3.2, $a(4)_3 = 0$.

$$(7.32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(3) > \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 134 \rangle, a(3)_5 = 0 \Rightarrow a(3)_2, a(3)_4 > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(2)_3 = a(4)_3 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (7.30) still holds for this case.

$$(7.33) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{depth } a(5) > \langle 135 \rangle \geq \langle 125 \rangle, (7.30) \Rightarrow a(5)_2, a(5)_3 > 0 \\ & \Rightarrow a(2)_5 = a(3)_5 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By $a(2)_3 = a(2)_5 = 0$, $\text{depth } a(2) \leq \langle 124 \rangle \geq \langle 125 \rangle$, contradiction!

We have proved that there does not exist a partition P of $[S]$ such that $\text{sdepth } P > d_5$ and completed the proof of Theorem 7.1. $\square$

8. CONCLUSIONS

We have determined the Stanley depth explicitly for the poset of $\mathbf{n}^k \setminus \mathbf{0}$ and the poset of nonempty submultisets of any multiset with at most five distinct elements. In the general case, if we know all the interval partitions of $[U_k]$, we can obtain the corresponding good partitions and find the Stanley depth of $[S]$ by choosing the best one from all good partitions. However, from the case of $k = 5$, we see that the situation will be extremely complicated when $k \geq 6$, so it would be interesting to know if there is a general explicit expression for the Stanley depth for any k . It would also be interesting to investigate other classes of posets to see if their Stanley depths can be found through a combinatorial approach.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. P. Stanley, *Linear Diophantine equations and local cohomology*, Invent. Math. 68(2), 175-193(1982).
- [2] C. Bir, D.M. Howard, M.T. Keller, W.T. Trotter and S.J. Young, *Interval partitions and Stanley depth*, Preprint (2008).
- [3] R. P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics*, Vol. 1, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York/Cambridge, UK, 1999.